

**Generic Smart Meter
Investigation
E-00000C-11-0328**

ORIGINAL



0000133525

ROBERTA & GREG HEINE

SCOTTSDALE AZ 85262

APS Customer Service
P.O. Box 53933
Phoenix AZ 85072-3933

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

JAN 19 2012

Re: APS Account No. [REDACTED]
AMI

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

1/12/12

Gentlemen:

Your letter of January 3, 2012 advised us that you intended to replace our traditional customer meter with a so-called "smart meter."

We do not wish you to do so. We believe that the "smart meters" are an unconstitutional invasion of our privacy and, once installed, would enable you to pry into our private lives and have the ability to furnish the information garnered to others or to sell for your own profit.

Certainly you have heard this complaint in the past. You are denied permission to enter our property for the purpose stated.

Very truly yours,

Roberta & Greg Heine

cc: The Goldwater Institute

- ✓ Gary Pierce, Arizona Corporation Commission
- Brenda Burns, Arizona Corporation Commission

RECEIVED
2012 JAN 19 A 11:29
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Antonio Gill

From: Mary Budinger [budinger@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2011 8:34 PM
To: Pierce-Web
Subject: Docket Number: E-00000C-11-0328

RE: Docket Number: E-00000C-11-0328

Public comment

Greetings,

You have before you now an issue of increased wireless transmissions, an issue that has been described as the “cigarettes of the 21st century.”

This from Arizona Public Service (APS): <http://www.aps.com/main/services/smartmeter.html>

APS is aware of the importance of the issue and of the concern it may cause some employees and the public. The association of potential health effects to EMFs has been studied and reviewed by numerous worldwide scientific and regulatory bodies. They have generally stated that there is no conclusive evidence that exposure to EMF found in homes, work locations, and near power lines have detrimental health effects. Additionally, no exposure standards have been developed by any regulatory body in Arizona or at the federal level. Scientific research regarding potential health effects from exposure to EMF continues.

With all due respect to APS, that is not a true statement. In 2002, the World Health Organization’s International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields as being possibly carcinogenic to humans (Group 2B) based on a link between childhood leukemia and power lines. In May, 2011, the IARC classified RF from cell phones as a ‘Possible Human Carcinogen’ (Class 2B), based on an increased risk for glioma, a malignant type of brain cancer.

These determinations change the debate from “whether artificial electromagnetic fields are safe” to “What can we do to make EMF emitting technologies safer?”

The science on EMF has progressed rapidly in recent years. People are taking note. Despite the fleet of lobbyists employed to convince us all that wireless phones present no safety concerns, the city of San Francisco followed voters’ wishes and mandated that SARS numbers be placed on cell phone boxes, for example.

History tells us that it took some 25 years for the powers that be to admit that smoking causes cancer. Like tobacco, the issue of EMF is fraught with political conflicts.

The New York based publication *Microwave News* examined the 85 papers on microwave effects on DNA that were published in peer-reviewed journals between 1990 and 2006. They found 42 papers reported no effect; 32 of those were funded by either the U.S. Air Force or industry. They found 43 papers reported there are health effects; only 3 were funded by Air Force or industry. ^[i]The same “we need more studies” technique was used by the tobacco industry for two decades to forestall censure and restrictions.

In May this year, for example, a lead expert on The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) RF decision-making committee, Anders Albom of the Karolinska Institute, was found to have concealed a professional association with a consulting firm advising the telecommunications industry. Dr. Albom, who has long taken the stand that there are no risks from cell phones, was ousted.

The conversion to smart meters is one of the largest technology rollouts in history, and yet virtually no public consultation with Arizona ratepayers was conducted in advance. Many Homeowners, business owners were not notified in advance their analog meter was going to be replaced by a wireless digital meter.

There appears to be virtually no science specifically addressing the biological or health effects of non-ionizing radiation emitting wireless smart meters. A search of PubMed, the repository for the vast majority of the world’s health-related research in the past half-century, returns zero results for the term “smart meter.”

Yet the evidence from thousands of published studies that address a wide range of adverse impacts from electrical and magnetic field, and radio-frequency radiation, suggests that the rapidly expanding wireless net that encompasses us all is a looming a major public health issue.

Given the existing evidence, the Council of Europe (advisory body to the European Parliament that has been tasked with promoting democracy and protecting human rights and the rule of law) issued a resolution in May 2011 expressing numerous concerns about possible harm from various electromagnetic emissions, and generally recommending a cautious approach, saying “there could be extremely high health and economic costs if early warnings are neglected,” similar to what happened with asbestos, leaded gasoline, and tobacco. The Council also said current international EMF standards “have serious limitations.”

Electrosmog, pollution through electromagnetic energy, is relatively new in human experience.

A human being is a complex organization of electrical fields. The body is about 70 percent water with a high mineral content making it highly electrically conductive. We have some 60 trillion cells, and between the nucleus and the membrane of each cell is a measurable electrical field. Brain cells, nerve cells, bone cells, all vibrate at different rates in order to communicate with one another. Cells know when to divide by vibrating. When you look at an EKG, for example, you see the electrical functioning of your heart. Although Western medicine has been focused on chemistry for last century, electricity is what drives our biology.

Electromagnetic fields produced by modern technologies are artificial intrusions with unnatural intensities, signaling characteristics, pulsing patterns, and wave forms. They can misdirect cells in myriad ways. “If you put a radio near a source of EMFs you will get interference,” said Olle Johansson, Associate Professor of Neuroscience at the Karolinska Institute in Sweden. “The human brain has an electric field so if you put sources of EMFs nearby, it is not surprising that you get interference, interaction with systems and damage to cells and molecules.”^[ii]

Schumann Wave = A frequency of energy created by the amount of times lightning strikes the earth every second of every day. The Schumann Wave is a steady frequency of energy that measures 7.83 Hz, and beats 7 to 10 times per second

When astronauts first traveled to space, they came home sick. They had been separated from gravity and from the Schumann Wave – the earth’s natural frequency, a constant vibration to which our bodies are attuned. When later space flights installed a Schumann Wave generator, astronauts came home in good shape. The steady rhythm of the Schumann Wave regulates our biological clock, our sleep/dream patterns, our patterns of arousal, and hormonal balance. Our optimal brain wave pattern duplicates the Schumann Wave. Human beings do best when they resonate with this frequency, which is what we have done since time began.

Man-made frequencies are unnatural; they exert a constant pressure on the cells to shift their natural vibration. Our DNA is affected because these unnatural fields carry enough energy to break the chemical bonds that hold DNA together. EMFs also slow our brain waves and affect our long term mental clarity, according to Eric Braverman, MD, an expert in the brain’s global impact on illness and health.

With no smart meter-specific evidence of safety regarding a wide range of possible adverse health impacts, should utilities be allowed to force smart meters on people? Should the meters be proven safe before they are installed – or should the “precautionary principle” be reversed, as it often is with U.S. law regarding chemical pollution? In other words, is it acceptable to allow utilities to install these meters, then require people to prove they are being harmed? Is it acceptable to charge people more when they ask to opt out more of the smart metering program and retain their analog meter? And in this case, with many government agencies and major environmental groups supporting smart meters, who will be the watchdogs?

Serious flaws are becoming apparent as utilities rapidly install smart meters across the country, according to a rising chorus of critics. People are concerned about privacy (real time monitoring of utility use), security (any utility’s system can be hacked), and health. Each of these issues warrants investigation and coverage.

There are key differences that distinguish smart meters from cell phones, wireless computers, microwave ovens, and similar devices: users of the latter typically have a choice whether to use them and exposure conditions are intermittent,

not chronic as with smart meters. With many utilities forcing customers to have a smart meter installed, no one served by that utility has a choice.

A growing chorus of health experts is concerned that the invisible fog of EMF in which we live exposes us to serious health risks such as increased Alzheimer's disease, breast cancer, Lou Gehrig disease, EMF immune system hypersensitivity, and disruption of brain function and DNA. The warning bells are sounding:

"Sensitivity to electromagnetic radiation is the emerging health problem of the 21st century. It is imperative health practitioners, governments, schools and parents learn more about it. The human health stakes are significant."

- William Rea, MD
Founder & Director of the Environmental Health Center, Dallas
Past President, American Academy of Environmental Medicine

"Studies of people have shown that both ELF and RF exposures result in an increased risk of cancer, and that this occurs at intensities that are too low to cause tissue heating. Unfortunately, all of our exposure standards are based on the false assumption that there are no hazardous effects at intensities that do not cause tissue heating. Based on the existing science, many public health experts believe it is possible we will face an epidemic of cancers in the future resulting from uncontrolled use of cell phones and increased population exposure to Wi-Fi and other wireless devices. Thus it is important that all of us, and especially children, restrict our use of cell phones, limit exposure to background levels of Wi-Fi, and that government and industry discover ways in which to allow use of wireless devices without such elevated risk of serious disease. We need to educate decision-makers that 'business as usual' is unacceptable. The importance of this public health issue cannot be underestimated."

- David Carpenter, MD
Professor, Environmental Health Sciences, and Director, Institute for Health and the Environment, School of Public Health, University of Albany, SUNY
Co-Editor, The BioInitiative Report (www.BioInitiative.org)

"There is no question EMFs have a major effect on neurological functioning. They slow our brain waves and affect our long-term mental clarity. We should minimize exposures as much as possible to optimize neurotransmitter levels and prevent deterioration of health."

- Eric Braverman, MD
Brain researcher, Author of *The Edge Effect*, and Director of Path Medical in New York City and The PATH Foundation.

"It is not necessary that the intensity be large for a biological interaction to occur. There is now considerable evidence that extremely weak signals can have physiological consequences. These interactive intensities are about 1000 times smaller than the threshold values formerly estimated by otherwise knowledgeable theoreticians, who, in their vainglorious approach to science, rejected all evidence to the contrary as inconsistent with their magnificent calculations. These faulty estimated thresholds are yet to be corrected by both regulators and the media."

- Abraham R. Liboff, PhD
Center for Molecular Biology and Biotechnology
Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida
Co-Editor, Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine

Should utilities comply with the Institute of Medicine's report released June 21, 2011^[iii], recommending that all levels of federal government consider the health impacts of their action – even when those actions don't seem to have a direct health component – since utilities are playing a quasi-governmental role and making decisions that affect a significant number of people?

Infrastructure deployment can proceed with safer technologies, but time is needed to consider alternatives such as fiber optic cable and other hard-wired alternatives, including analog meters, instead of wireless devices that are creating layers of electronic pollution throughout the United States. It is the cumulative effect of long-term exposure to this radiation that is of great concern to scientists and an increasing number of citizens.

The Arizona Corporation Commission sits as an elected tribunal and makes decisions in contested matters; thus the commissioners are in place to bring balance between the interests of industry and the interests of the citizenry. Thus it seems appropriate to give citizens the right to:

- (1) Be advised in advance that their utility would be switching them over to a smart meter.
- (2) Be able to opt at no charge, and continue with a non-smart meter at no extra monthly charge.
- (3) Move slowly with the implementation of smart meters until more study has been done on adverse health impacts.

I understand the business interest in utilizing a new technology that may save operating costs. However, given the mounting concerns about health and privacy, there can be no penalty applied as if the new technology were mandatory and approved by voters.

Respectfully,

Mary Budinger

4546 E. Cortez Street
Phoenix, AZ 85028
602-494-1999
Budinger@earthlink.net

^[1] L. Slesin, 'Radiation Research and The Cult of Negative Results', *Microwave News*, vol. 26, no. 4, July 2006.

^[2] Salford LD, Brun AE et al. Nerve cell damage in mammalian brain after exposure to microwaves from GSM mobile phones. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2003 June; 111(7): 881-883

^[3] <http://www8.nationalacademies.org/onpinews/newsitem.aspx?RecordID=13093>

11/29/11

AZ Corporation Commission

attn: Commissioners

Has anyone researched

Concerns by Milisen?

If not, why not?

In all sincerity,

Donald Edick

501 Turtleback Rd.

Prescott, AZ 86303

NOV 30 2011

Are Smart Meters Really Smart?

By Robert G. Milisen, N.M.D.

(This article is informative only and is not meant to diagnose, treat, influence or help any condition or decision)

What is a smart meter? That is what I wondered when I got home from a trip this summer and there was a new digital electric meter stuck on my house. Patients started bringing information to me and I began researching smart meters. I decided that I did not want a new meter and called the utility company. They were very polite when I called and the supervisor told me they would put me on a list, but at this time there was no other option. Have a nice day.

I am in the process of getting the meter changed back to the old one.

Why might I decide this? Since 2009 smart meters have been introduced into many markets touted as the device to save energy and "green" the planet. They are claimed to be a low frequency, weak radio emitter that has really no effect on heating human tissue (the standard for U.S. devices). What is bothersome is there is really no data on how these wireless routers on the house might affect the human nervous system

with gross or subtle wireless signals.

California has begun legislation to block these meters until more information is gathered. There are groups of patients around the country who have shown symptoms with increased electrical emissions that range from fatigue and insomnia to heart problems and cancer.

Those of you that read my EMF article a few months ago may remember that electrical and radio waves can have a tremendous impact on the immune and nervous systems. Minimizing exposure is key. Logically then, adding more wireless frequencies to your home from your new smart meter and your neighbor's may not be such a good long-term idea.

This topic is becoming a heated debate and the best way to deal with it is to become better informed. Please visit the following sites www.electricalpollution.com and www.lessEMF.com.

Bullies come in all shapes, sizes, ages

The playground isn't the only place where you'll run into bullies.

led to suicides, the rise, and inter what busin If you think ing behavior j think ag

